



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

DID SEVENTEENTH CENTURY IRISHMEN DRESS FOR DINNER?

SIR,—A recent issue of the REVIEW contains an article by Havelock Ellis entitled "The Genius of England," which contains at least one statement creating an entirely false impression of the morals of the Irish people in the seventeenth century and before.

On page 213 appears the following: "The Irish, even of high social class, as Fynes Moryson bore witness, sometimes dispensed with clothing as late as the seventeenth century." He means, of course, that the Irish like the old Indians and African savages, were accustomed to go around naked, or nearly so.

Such a statement must be branded as a lie by any person acquainted with Irish history who is not animated by hatred of the Irish people, and a desire to help the English to pose as civilizers of a people vastly more cultured in olden times than was the conquering nation.

That Mr. Ellis is forced to rely upon the trash retailed by Lord Mountjoy's anti-Irish secretary (he can't be dignified with the name "historian") is in itself suggestive of the utter falsity of the assertion he makes.

Before Mr. Ellis again attempts to write anything concerning the Irish people, let him consult *authorities*. Let him read the History of Ireland by E. A. D'Alton, M. R. I. A.; works of Mrs. A. S. Green, Dr. P. W. Joyce, Mitchell, the "Four Masters."

In the introduction to his *History of Ireland*, Dr. Geoffrey Keating deals with Fynes Moryson and other English writers who spread abroad such criminal falsehoods as that which Mr. Ellis gave vent to. Dr. Keating lived in Ireland in the seventeenth century and wrote soon after Moryson.

C. R. MILLER.

BURLINGTON, IOWA.

WE HAVE ALREADY DECIDED

SIR,—The dialogue, "The Political Situation," in your September issue, is puzzling. Your Editor's logic or his conscience needs treatment. What is the determining factor for which he is waiting before deciding whom to vote for in the Presidential election? Certainly he cannot support Mr. Wilson, as henceforward there can be nothing but talk by both candidates. Mr. Wilson's Administration is closed, practically, until after November. Does your Editor propose to decide the vexing question upon the speeches to be made by Mr. Wilson and Justice Hughes? Is it oratory and argument he awaits? To be sure, he will not accept Mr. Wilson's talk as against his record as President. And if your Editor is to be believed, that record is "rotten to the core." Not only is every public act and word of Mr. Wilson's false, dishonest, incapable and demagogical, but he is a miserable character, according to the Editor—the most unworthy and incapable of all citizens for the great office he holds. This being the case, the Editor must have a sorry estimate of Justice Hughes, or his mind would be in no such doubtful state.

To be sure, your Editor has a nightmare. All the Democrats I know believe Mr. Wilson to be one of the greatest (if not the very greatest) Presidents this country ever had; but that is really not the question troubling your readers. It is this: Upon what ground does your Editor propose to

decide how he will cast his vote? It seems impossible to write so long an article, and in such excellent style, and still avoid a semblance of logic; but your Editor has achieved that feat.

THOS. P. STEGER.

BONHAM, TEXAS.

FROM A DISGUSTED DEMOCRAT

SIR,—I beg leave to express my thanks for your editorial comment in this month's NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW in its entirety. You do not dwell on the disastrous Underwood tariff quite as strongly as many of us would have liked, but where the whole is so powerful a document, it would be but poor taste to cavil.

Personally I am a Democrat, and have voted for seven successive Democratic candidates for the Presidency, but I can not and will not vote again for a party that has worked such havoc in business by its free trade insanity as has the party of Woodrow Wilson. Of course he is hedging on the tariff, as he hedges on everything else that he thinks he knows his own mind about for twenty-four hours. But that will not work. I'm through with Woodrow Wilson and his party.

And that is why I am asking the privilege of extending my personal thanks to you for your this month's editorial. When anybody asks me why I have dropped Wilson, whom I voted for four years ago, I have in compact form in your article a better explanation of my change of mind than I could ever get together myself in a year's effort at expressing myself.

MANUFACTURER.

AKRON, OHIO.

FROM THE SOUTH

SIR,—I can almost cry for joy when, here among these little, unfair newspapers, I can still find the truth (as by its both-sidedness I am convinced it is) in your editorial: "For President, Charles Evan Hughes." This is not because I am Democrat, Progressive, or Republican, but because I am American.

Do you think it is too much to hope that some just man or men with money will before long invest in a newspaper down here that will tell the truth and the whole truth, whoever it hurts or benefits? It is ignorance that makes the South "solid" like a drove of sheep, thus making ineffectual the votes of those (now a very few) thoughtful and honest men whose convictions are, and whose votes would be, for the best interests, as they understand them, of all the people, regardless of party lines. Four or five editors with your courage, effectively distributed over the Southern States, could in fewer years than might at first be thought, redeem the South from the slavery under ignorance that now binds and retards it.

The Kansas City *Star* has done for its community what can be done here if some persons with grit, and the money to back it, will buy and conduct, as suggested above, some Southern papers.

I am one of your sincere admirers.

C. H. RICHMOND.

SAVANNAH, GEORGIA.